



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,082	08/28/2003	Udo Klein	15609-017001 / 2003P00621	7222
32864	7590	11/19/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ROBINSON, GRETA LEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2169	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,082

Applicant(s)

KLEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Greta L. Robinson

Art Unit

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Independent Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 9-20 has status previously withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 1 the following limitation does not appear to be defined in the disclosure as claimed: **"equivalence relation comprising that changes in one of the first record and the second date record are to be synchronized with the other of the first data record and the second data record"** [see claim 1 lines 8-11]. In the response Applicant states support for the newly added limitation can be found in the disclosure at page 10 line lines 14-22; however the cited passage does not specifically define the element of an equivalence relation. The disclosure *does not* describe the equivalence relation comprising that changes in one of the first data record and the second data record are to be synchronized with the other of

the first data record and the second data record *as defined in amended claim* limitation.

Note the examiner has interpreted the limitation equivalence relation as simply a relationship or association as known in the data processing art (see specification page 10 lines 14-22; and pages 6-10 of remarks filed August 12, 2008). Claims 2-8 are rejected based on dependency.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the following limitation is vague: "equivalence relation comprising that changes in one of the first record and the second date record are to be synchronized with the other of the first data record and the second data record" [see claim 1 lines 8-11]. Claims 2-8 are rejected based on dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukundan et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0177587 A1 in view of Gusack US Patent 6,112,209.

Regarding claim 1, **Mukundan et al.** teaches a computer-implemented method comprising: selecting a first data record stored at a first level of a data model, the first data record being connected to other first-level data by way of central data stored at a second level of the data model [note: page 5 paragraph 0090 *data model* which serves as the basis for various applications ; page 25 paragraph 0762 At block 3630, in response to the user's selection of the respective command item, the command associated with the respective item is routed to an appropriate destination for processing; Figure 36 note steps 3620 through 3640; also note abstract "a method is provided in which a **first field** and a **second field** of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program, the second field

having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first field. In response to a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent to a server program. The server program is configured to process the changed value of the first field and determine corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the second field”];

associating the first data record with a grouping value that is generated based on a pre-determined grouping reason [note: page 25 paragraph 0762; Figure 36 steps 3620 through 3640; command objects may be defined page 25 paragraph 0763];

selecting a second data record stored at the first level that has an equivalence relation comprising that changes in one of the first record and the second data record are to be synchronized with the other of the first data record and the second data record [note: paragraph 0762 and 0189; Figure 37 step 3760; Figures 20, 21, 38 and 39; note Mukundan et al. teaches a business object can be defined and configured as logical groupings or mapping (i.e. an equivalence relation) of various business components see paragraphs 0765 and 0091 the application framework may include various logical groupings; logical grouping provide a means of synchronizing the data see paragraphs 0766 and 0067, 0076 rules for transferring data]; and

associating the second data record with the grouping value, such that a modification of the first data record will result in a synchronizing modification of the second data record but not of a record connected to the central data is not associated with the grouping value [note: “a method is provided in which a first field and a second field of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program, the second field having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first field. In response to a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent to a server program. The server

program is configured to process the changed value of the first field and determine corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the second field" abstract; Figures 37-39 and 41; *logical grouping or mapping may be defined* see paragraph 0765 paragraphs 0076]. Although Mukundan et al. teaches the invention substantially, they do not explicitly teach a grouping value. Mukundan et al. teaches logical grouping or mappings may be defined to associate identified fields for changes [paragraph 0091]. **Gusack** teaches a linking value (i.e. grouping value) [see: abstract "The linking values stored in the central linking table indexes may be predefined to automatically structure and link a plurality of unspecified data changes in the data may alter the linking structure to provide further capabilities"; column 1 lines 1-10; column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55 linking value]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Gusack with Mukundan et al. because a linking value or grouping value would enable contents of the first field to be dynamically linked and synchronized with the contents of the second field when modified.

8. Regarding claims 2-4:

(claim 2) "wherein the group value is time-dependent" [see: Mukundan et al. page 20 paragraph 0677 a design-time menu activation/suppression feature is provided for applet-level menu ; also note Gusack col. 10 lines 41-59 changes are automatic; Figure 21];

(claim 3) "determining that the group value has changed from a first grouping value to a second grouping value with respect to the first data record; and

re-assessing synchronization of the first data record and second data record based on the second grouping value" [note: Gusack col. 9 lines 21-36];

(claim 4) "wherein re-assessing synchronization of the first data record and second data record based on the second grouping value comprises:

determining that the second data record continues to be associated with the first grouping value;

splitting the first data record into a first portion and a second portion that are associated with the first grouping value and the second grouping value, respectively; and

modifying content of the second portion to reflect association with the second grouping value" [note: Gusack col. 10 lines 41-59 changes are automatic; Figure 21 note software procedure].

9. Regarding claim 5, wherein associating the first data record with the grouping value comprises:

examining contents of pre-designed record of a set of data records of which the first data record is a part; and

generating the grouping value based on the contents [note: Mukundan et al paragraph 0091 logical groupings of various types may be implemented, paragraph 0097 and 0109-0111; and column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55].

10. Regarding claim 6, wherein the first data record and the second data record are time-dependent and time-constrained [note: Mukundan et al. page 20 paragraph 0677 a design-time menu activation/suppression feature is provided for applet-level menu; Figure 19].

11. Regarding claims 7 and 8:

(claim 7) "wherein the central data includes data related to a single person [note: Mukundan et al. paragraph 0071];

(claim 8) "wherein the first data record relates to a first work assignment of the person, and the second record relates to a second work assignment of the person" [note: Mukundan et al. paragraphs 0068-0070 and 0063; paragraph 0099 through 0103 assignment of tasks through assignment Manager].

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed August 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the response Applicant argued the following:

ARGUMENT: Mukundan and Gusack do not teach a method for using an equivalence relation to determine if changes are to be synchronized between equivalently related data records as amended.

RESPONSE: The Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection. Mukundan teaches “a method, apparatus, and system for immediate posting of changes in a client server environment” see paragraph 0001. Changes are implemented in real time through synchronization processes which include blocking ability see paragraphs 0068 and 0120. Mukundan et al. provides for the limitation of a data model see paragraphs 0063 “The data storages services 170 provide the data storage for the data model”. At page 25 paragraph 0762 *selection and associating provisions* as follows: “At block 3630, in response to the user’s selection of the respective command item, the command associated with the respective item is routed to an appropriate destination for processing”; Figure 36 note steps 3620 through 3640; also note abstract “a method is provided in which a first field and a second field of a data record are displayed to a user using a client program, the second field having one or more attributes that are dependent upon the value of the first field. In response to a detection that the first field has changed, the value of the first field is sent to a server program. The server program is configured to process the changed value of the first field and determine corresponding changes with respect to the one or more attributes of the second field”. At paragraph 0763 note “user interface item object is associated to a corresponding object.” Mukundan et al. does not specifically provide for the limitation of a grouping value; however they do teach logical grouping or mapping may be defined to associate identified fields for changes (i.e. equivalence relation) [see: paragraph 0091; paragraphs 0765 and 0091 the application framework may include various logical groupings; logical grouping provide a means of synchronizing the data see paragraphs 0766 and 0067, 0076 rules for transferring data]. Gusack teaches a linking value or grouping value [see: abstract “The linking values stored in the central linking table indexes may be predefined to

automatically structure and link a plurality of unspecified data changes in the data may alter the linking structure to provide further capabilities"; column 1 lines 1-10; column 3 lines 54-58; column 23 lines 33-55 linking value J. The motivation to combine the cited references is that a linking value or grouping value would enable contents of the first field to be dynamically linked and synchronized with the contents of the second field when modified. Note Mukundan provides for synchronization modification [see: paragraphs 0067-0068, 0078 and 0083].

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McFadden US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126137 A1

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169a
November 14, 2008

